



**Executive Committee Meeting
October 30, 2001
Draft - Meeting Summary**

The following is a summary of presentations given, issues raised, actions undertaken or recommendations made. When possible, lengthy discussions have been summarized into themes or summary statements.

Executive Committee members present:

- | | | |
|--|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> George Kargianis
Chair | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rob McKenna
Vice-Chair, King County | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dan Mathis
FHWA |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Santos Contreras (Alt.)
City of Kirkland | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sen. Horn
WA State Senate | <input type="checkbox"/> Sen. Margarita Prentice
WA State Senate |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Connie Marshall
City of Bellevue | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Bob Edwards
PSRC | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Randy Corman
City of Renton |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> John Okamoto
WSDOT | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rosemarie Ives
City of Redmond | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Steve Mullet
City of Tukwila |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Dick Paylor
City of Bothell | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Joan McBride
City of Kirkland | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grant Degginger (Alt.)
City of Bellevue |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sonny Putter
City of Newcastle | <input type="checkbox"/> Pam Carter (Alt.)
City of Tukwila | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Aubrey Davis (Alt.)
WSTC |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> David Dye (Alt.)
WSDOT | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Barbara Cothorn
Snohomish County | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dave Somers
Snohomish County |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rep. Cheryl Pflug
WA State House of Reps. | <input type="checkbox"/> Rep. Christopher Hurst
WA State House of Reps. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tim Olsen
City of Bothell |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Sen. Julia Patterson (Alt.)
WA State Senate | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Harold Taniguchi
WSDOT | |

Staff and Observers

Johannes Kurz, Snohomish County
Phil Fordyce, WSDOT
Barbara Gilliland, Sound Transit

Kim Becklund, Bellevue
Tom Paine, Redmond City Council

Project Management Team

Mike Cummings, WSDOT
Don Samdahl, Mirai Associates
Keith McGowan, McGowan Environmental
Ron Anderson, DEA
Phil Fordyce, WSDOT
Kim Farley, WSDOT
Nytasha Sowers, WSDOT

Paul Bergman, PRR
Brian O'Sullivan, Sound Transit
Ann Martin, King County
Melanie Moores, WSDOT
Christina Martinez, WSDOT
Rita Brogan, PRR

CALL TO ORDER

Vice-chair Rob McKenna called the meeting to order at 9:10 a.m. and reviewed the meeting focus:

- Update on Program Status and Schedule
- Preferred Alternative Recommendations Process
- Feedback from Steering and Citizen Committees on Areas of Preliminary Consensus
- Discussion on Remaining Issues

Vice-chair McKenna said the committee would take a break before the All Committee meeting.

He invited public comment. No public comment was requested.

Vice-chair McKenna asked for a vote to approve the last meeting's summary. The meeting summary was approved without changes. He turned the meeting over to Mr. Cummings, WSDOT.

Mr. Cummings gave a schedule update. He reminded the committee that the All Committees meeting is to review the DEIS public comments received to date.

Mr. Cummings reviewed the schedule for future committee meetings. He said the meeting on Nov. 16 is to decide on preferred alternative recommendations. He said that some members are not available on the 16th. He asked if members are instead available on Nov. 14th?

Vice-chair McKenna said that Chairman Kargianis is in Vancouver today and apologizes for not attending the meeting.

The committee said that Nov. 14th doesn't work because it's Commissioners Day and some members will not be available.

Mr. Cummings said he was already notified that some members aren't available Nov. 15th.

Ms. Marshall said she can't attend the current meeting time on Nov. 16th but she can meet before 10:30 a.m. and after 1:30 p.m.

Vice-chair McKenna asked if members are available 1:30 – 5:30 p.m. There was a general agreement to change the meeting to this time, same location.

Mr. Cummings reviewed the fall speakers' bureau. He noted that their upcoming meeting with Kirkland on November 7th is missing from the slide.

DRAFT EIS Update:

- DEIS issued August 17 • Public Hearings held Sept. 18, 19 & 20.
- Comment period ended October 24.
- Received over 1,700 emails, letters, cards, comment forms and public testimony to date.
- Comments can be reviewed on internal website.
- Public comment review meeting to follow with more details.

Upcoming Public Outreach Activities:

Communicating the Decision

- Newsletter
- Citizen's Guide on Preferred Alternative
- Website
- Speaking Engagements
- Media Outreach

Mr. Cummings said they are willing to meet with various groups and organizations to talk about the decision being made.

Mr. Somers asked if the internal website is available to people outside the program. Mr. Bergman said anyone could access it if the committee members want to forward the information to folks.

Mr. Cummings reviewed the PA Decision Process. He said that concurrence forms would be sent with a detailed description of the PA. He said concurrence with conditions would be allowed so they can understand what issues are still on table that need to be resolved.

Mr. Cummings reviewed the Process for Today:

- Review/discuss Steering and Citizen Committees' Areas of Preliminary consensus.
- Review/discuss remaining issues.
- Make recommendations at November 16 meeting.

Steering and Citizen Preliminary Consensus Elements identified included:

- #1- TDM Package • #2- Transit Expansion
- #3c- High Capacity Transit: Bus Rapid Transit
- #3- High Capacity Transit: Study Fixed Guideway in Central Core Area
- #4- Arterial HOV Priority
- #5- HOV Express on I-405 with Direct Access Ramps
- #6- Add Park and Ride Capacity to Match Demand
- #7- Add Transit Center Capacity to Match Demand
- #8 - Basic I-405 Improvements
- #12- Add Collector Distributor lanes on I-405 where needed
- #14- SR 167 / 405 Interchange improvements
- #15- Improve Connecting Freeway Capacity to I-405
- #16- Implement planned arterial improvements
- #17- Expand Capacity on North-South Arterials
- #18- Upgrade Connecting Arterial Connections to I-405
- #19- Corridor Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements
- #20- Corridor Intelligent Transportation System Improvements
- #21- Corridor Freight Enhancements

Mr. Cummings said he would go through the list completely before taking comments. Afterwards he will be asking the committee if they have a consensus on the list. They will then focus on the issues that still need to be resolved.

Mr. Cummings said a description of the TDM package elements are in the PA workbook. He said that Mr. Bergman has extra copies of the workbook if they need one.

Mr. Cummings said the Transit Expansion element is consistent with the chosen alternative.

Mr. Cummings said there is an issue of deferring the decision on east/west travel regarding the Central Core element.

Mr. Cummings said Arterial HOV Priority will be in specified locations.

Mr. Cummings said the HOV element is in reference to HOV-to-HOV connections.

The SR 167/405 element is matched to the number of GP lanes provided.

Mr. Cummings said the Capacity on I-405 would depend on the number of lanes on the freeway to ensure there is enough receiving capacity.

Mr. Cummings said these are all items that are generally in consensus per the Citizen and Steering committees. There is general agreement that these elements should be included in the PA. However, it doesn't mean the committee(s) can't come back to these elements.

Mr. Cummings said for each of the elements, they have been provided a description and background information for basis of discussion. Mr. Cummings asked if there were any issues on the consensus list that the committee thinks should be moved to the needs more discussion list.

Ms. Ives said she wants to discuss a fixed HCT technology within the I-405 ROW. She said Element #3 is only in the central core area. She said she just came from a monorail meeting and wants to know if Seattle will construct a facility within 5 years without disruption. She said it's important to be consistent with growth management and would like to know where they want growth.

Vice-chair McKenna asked Ms. Ives if she wants to take Element #3 and study it in the central core area in ROW? Ms. Ives said she would like it studied in the whole corridor area, not just in the core. She said specifically from the beginning in Bothell to Tukwila. She said she would like to move people between identified urban centers.

Ms. Cothorn said there have been talks about alignment following I-405 and having dedicated alignment, but that doesn't necessarily preclude doing something within the ROW. She said page 9 of the PA worksheet includes information on alignments.

Ms. Ives said anytime you go outside the ROW footprint, everything gets triggered including cost and environmental impacts. She said they need to do something in the short term and they need to do this within the ROW.

Vice-chair McKenna asked what the indications are to study this. Mr. Cummings said if they study this, Element 3c becomes a different description. He said it would look a lot like Alternative 1 and 2 and includes portions in the BNSF and portions in the I-405 corridor, including employment centers.

Mr. Ives said the monorail is something the program can do in the corridor quickly. She said it's consistent with the growth management and the vision of 2020 and 2030. She said she would support Alternative 3 with that caveat.

Vice-chair McKenna asked if Ms. Ives is asking for this to be included in the study so the program's options for putting in monorail are preserved or if she is asking that building the monorail be part of the study.

Ms. Ives said she thinks fixed HCT should be in Phase 1.

Senator Horn thought the committee had agreed to have an element of HCT called bus rapid transit. He said that if the committee is trying to get the program focused, they have to quit expanding the study forever. He said the committee members need specifics and then they need to take that forward for funding. He said he wants to minimize changing the directions they've been heading and does not want to just study everything. He argued that this takes away from obtaining project funding.

Ms. Ives said she doesn't think including this study is a change. She said the Redmond City Council has strong support for Alternative 2 and 5. She said this study addresses the needs of what they've heard. It pushes the limits. She asked if the staff has been open to hearing public input? She just wants the issue considered.

Mr. Somers said they should highlight their consideration of expanding the studies. However, he said he would like to get through the element list during today's meeting.

Ms. Marshall said she doesn't know why the study isn't already included. The description implies that it would generally follow I-405, allowing for specific areas where it might have to go outside due to constraints. She said the program is only at 1% design so it allows more flexibility to study what Ms. Ives is suggesting. She said the program must emphasize cost effectiveness.

Ms. Ives said she disagrees. BRT and HCT are within this, but is not a fixed guideway within the ROW.

Vice-chair McKenna said the PPA would involve BRT and they've been studying a fixed guideway within the corridor to keep options open. He clarified that Ms. Ives is suggesting the study of a fixed guideway throughout the corridor.

Ms. Ives said she wouldn't preclude getting information on BRT. The jury is still out. She said Redmond is still deliberating over which alternative to choose and trying to find something that the whole council agrees on. She said, personally, she likes Alternative 2.

Mr. McKenna asked staff to bring Mayor Ives issue back to the committee for their next meeting with more substance and if anyone has any other issues regarding the elements list.

Ms. Cothorn asked about Element 17. She said she thought there was some constraint on expanding. Mr. Cummings said the north-south arterials are in the program. He said the new road improvement is only on the Willows Road Extension up to Bothell and going through Woodinville.

Members were in agreement on the consensus list.

Remaining Elements/Issues included:

TDM

- Expanded TDM Package (Regional Pricing Through PSRC)

ROADWAY CAPACITY

- Add General Purpose Lanes Each Direction on I-405
- Lane Balance: Third Lane South of I-90
- Widen SR 167 by up to 2 lanes Each Direction

OTHER ELEMENTS

- Preservation of BNSF Right-of-Way for Future Transportation Opps.
- Managed Lanes: Manage up to 2 Lanes Each Direction
- Managed Lanes: Utilize Tolls as a Management Tools

Mr. Cummings turned the meeting over to Mr. Samdahl to discuss regional pricing.

Regional Pricing:

- PSRC Pricing Task Force recommends pricing be included as part of Destination 2030
- Pricing to be used for:
 - Financing transportation infrastructure
 - Improve efficiency of transportation
- Conduct pricing demonstration program prior to 2006
- Specific pricing strategies are not prescribed

Mr. Samdahl said the committees haven't reached closure on a TDM element that considers regional pricing. He said that the PSRC recommended pricing be included.

Regional Pricing – What Could Be Included?

- Region-wide congestion pricing
- Fuel Taxes
- Mileage Charges (such as a VMT fee)
- Parking Charges
- Tolls (will be discussed in the context of 'managed lanes')

Mr. Samdahl said they want to separate tolls from the current discussion and save it for talk regarding managed lanes ideas. He said tolls are specific to the facility rather than as part of the regional strategy. As part of TDM program, Mr. Samdahl asked the committee if any of the listed items are appropriate for inclusion in the I-405 program?

Mr. Samdahl asked Mr. Davis to give some background.

Mr. Davis said they don't think regional pricing should be connected to a specific corridor. He said it's a regional, not corridor, issue. He doesn't think it's appropriate to include it in the study. Sooner or later they will have to deal with demand. He said they would never get people off the roads if they think driving is free. He suggested that regional pricing doesn't need to be part of the I-405 study, just something to think about.

Senator Horn said he agrees with Mr. Davis. Regional pricing is a regional or even state issue. It's a major policy change and should affect everybody.

Mr. Edwards said regional pricing was also addressed in the SR 520 or Translake process. He suggested the idea be brought into each corridor discussion to show how all the improvements will be more effective.

Ms. Cothorn asked if the I-405 Corridor Program can cooperate with PSRC in some kind of a model.

Mr. Davis said yes. Any demonstration should include this part of the county. He said they need to keep the idea alive in their minds and include it in discussions.

Mr. Putter said he favors discussion of regional pricing but in the appropriate forum and doesn't think this is it. He said they need to do something regional. He said the committee's goal is to converge on something they can do rather than open up something that is somewhat unknown. He said they should even leave it on the table because when they get to tolls there are clearly some management issues that can be improved. He suggested pricing possibly be included in the management lanes discussion instead.

Mr. Somers said they still have a funding problem in regards to regional pricing. He said the committee needs to keep the issue on the table as an option. However, he doesn't see how it fits into I-405 project. It's a regional issue and an issue for them because they have a funding problem for I-405 and it could be their solution. If regional pricing is the only way they can get the project funded, it may become an issue for them. He said the committee should express the opinion that it be done regionally and is not just an I-405 problem. He urged the committee to express support of the element and leave it on the table.

Senator Horn said funding would be an issue. The more things they can get off the table, the more chance the program has. He said they should move separate issues off the table and be more specific.

Vice-chair McKenna asked what the process is for taking the EIS and using it to address broader policy issues that extend beyond the process. Mr. Samdahl said that if they want regional pricing included in the PA, they would have to do more research on that in the FEIS. If they want a further study, they would acknowledge it in FEIS and a recommendation process would be looked at separately. He said he doesn't think they will be required to look at it closer than they already have.

Mr. McGowan said if they choose Option 1, it doesn't mean it won't ever be included again. It would be more of a message that they strongly don't think it should be considered.

Senator Horn argued that it's a different subject than what the program is focusing on.

Ms. Pflug said she doesn't think it should be included.

Mr. Edwards said he is leaning more towards Option 3. He said he doesn't think this process is where they should analyze regional pricing in great detail. However, they need to acknowledge it might be a solution. He said he doesn't want to see a lot more work done on regional pricing in this group. He said he now understands the issue after they explained Option 1 and 2.

Sen. Horn said they should not be considering regional pricing at all. They shouldn't even suggest that it needs to be studied in the future. He said it adds confusion to the program. Senator Horn suggested they just reword Option 3.

Mayor Putter said he does not agree with any of the options.

Mr. McKenna asked the staff to come up with different wording and send it out to the members and they can talk about it at the next meeting. He said he doesn't want to

force a decision until they see the language. He said the staff should develop a couple of options.

Mr. Samdahl said they are not looking for a decision today but just need to narrow down the issues. He said the team has the positions and comments from the other committees who also expressed the same ambivalence.

Preliminary Feedback from Committees:

•Steering Committee:

- Generally supports concept
- Could be opportunity for demonstration project

•Citizen Committee:

- Majority oppose; minority in favor.
- Requested more clarification of elements: Is it a demand management tool or for raising revenues

Mr. Edwards said pricing is a funding mechanism. However, pricing affects the way people use the facilities, when they chose to use system. He said the issue needs to be discussed in a different forum.

I-405 Capacity Options:

- #1 - Support PPA (up to 2 lanes)
- #2 - Support other alternatives
 - + 0 Lanes (Alt 1)
 - + 1 Lane (Alt 2)
 - 2 Express +1 Lane (Alt 4)
- #3 – Variation of the Above

Preliminary Feedback from Committees:

•Steering Committee:

- General support for PPA by local jurisdictions.
- Resource agencies concerned about environmental impacts; mitigation concept unclear – needs more definition.

•Citizen Committee:

- Majority support PPA; minority support other concepts (1 lane, no lanes, targeted improvements)
- Concerns over environmental impacts, costs, and sustainability
- Consider also looking at improvement to other regional facilities

Vice-chair McKenna asked if anyone had questions.

Ms. Marshall asked what the position of Renton, Newcastle and Tukwila was on this issue. She said she thought one to two lanes would provide an efficient transportation system. But now with more study, they discovered there would still be a lot of congestion without lane balance south of I-90.

Mr. Putter said his goal is to achieve a reduction in congestion in the area of the DEIS that said there wouldn't be a reduction. He said Newcastle wants whatever works to reduce congestion in that segment.

Mr. Corman said Renton is neutral. He said they're waiting for more data and public works staff to give them an opinion. He anticipates that adding an additional lane will create more conflict from some neighborhoods. However, he said it's up to the

Executive Committee. If they want to do this, he will actively promote it. He said he might get some opposition but it will probably be worth it in the long run.

Mr. Mullet said there's some issues on how traffic will get in and out of business areas. But other than that, Tukwila is happy with this.

Senator Horn said the PPA is two lanes in each direction but the wording "up to" has a different connotation. He said they are giving the wrong implication.

Mr. Samdahl said they had this discussion and this is the way the committee wanted the wording. He said collector and distributor lanes could substitute or add to the numbers in some areas.

Mr. Cummings said there may be sections where adding two lanes doesn't help at all. He said they've chosen this wording because it gives flexibility to the design system so they can come up with something that works overall.

Mr. Dye said this is confusing and misleading. There are many locations where more than two physical lanes will be constructed. He said the slide should note "basic" or "main" lanes.

Freeway Lanes Balance Issue:

- With two added lanes along corridor, congestion remains in south end
- Additional study (s. of I-90) looked at
 - +3 lanes
 - Auxiliary and truck climbing lanes

Mr. Samdahl showed a slide that illustrated the 3rd Lane South of I-90.

Lane Balance Results in South End:

- +3 lanes
- Diverts traffic to corridor
- Some congestion benefits
- High cost
- Auxiliary and truck-climbing lanes
- Focused investment at key locations
- Likely congestion benefits
- Preparing cost and property impacts

Preliminary Feedback from Committees:

• Steering Committee:

- Resource agencies concerned about environmental impacts
- Concerns over price and community impacts of adding third lane

• Citizen Committee:

- Majority support including third lane; minority oppose
- Requested more clarification of this element.

He said this would not mean an additional lane in the whole corridor but it does give them the option. He said it won't divert as much new traffic into the corridor.

Mr. Edwards asked if adding an additional lane to I-405 south of I-90 would divert traffic that would otherwise be using I-90 and I-5. Mr. Samdahl said they didn't see

a drop on I-90 but did see some reduction on I-5. He said it does create changes in travel patterns. However, he said the team didn't go into a lot of detail.

Mr. Putter asked if there is any implication on what lane balance will do to the arterials in that part of the corridor. Mr. Samdahl said there is a slight reduction on Coal Creek Parkway, about 5%. He said there are not a lot of arterials in that section. He said lane balance would not solve the congestion problem.

Mr. Putter said whatever achieves the outcome of bringing down congestion in that segment will work for Newcastle.

Senator Horn said that getting traffic off the neighborhood streets is what it's all about. He said it seems like this option is positive but they also need to think about Port Quendall. He said they should consider the option of a 3rd lane in that area.

Mr. Putter said he wants to focus more on the system than just his area. He asked if Port Quendall has been considered in any modeling? Mr. Samdahl said yes.

Mr. Pflug said her area is dependant on the corridor. She said the issue of lane balance is important and thinks they should be looking at what future expansions like Port Quendall will bring.

Ms. Ives asked Mr. Putter what his vision is. Mr. Putter said he doesn't have a specific vision of what the segment should look like. He said he does know that the DEIS stated that the area's congestion is the cause of the regional bottleneck. He said that if it takes a 3rd lane, it would be expensive but doable. He said he would go up to 4 lanes in each direction. But now he sees this won't achieve the outcome he's looking for. So, maybe it should also include some additional arterial and truck climbing lanes. He said they need to go with what works to achieve his desirable outcome for the system.

Ms. Ives asked Mr. Samdahl what the maximum number of lanes is. Mr. Samdahl said the PPA would go from 3 to 5 lanes in each direction. He said this conversation is about whether to go to 6 lanes in each direction or some combination.

Mr. Dye said it is not inconceivable to have up to 7 lanes but that will be the extreme.

Ms. Ives said she just wants to make sure everyone has the same facts and that they know WSDOT is recommending that up to 7 lanes is acceptable.

Mr. Putter said he understands.

Mr. Mullet said they have a lot of slow lanes that aren't being used. He said he wants people using all the lanes that are being built. He said he doesn't think truck lanes are being used because they don't want to merge. However, moving freight is an essential part of the program. He asked where they want to end and start truck lanes?

Ms. Marshall said the staff wants the opportunity to explore what options there are to make the system operate optimally. She thinks the south end people are just saying they want to give the staff opportunity to explore.

Mr. Pflug said she's confused about why the 3rd lane will not decrease congestion. Is this because people are being enticed off of I-5?

Mr. Dye said the types of trips on I-405 are short trips. If they entice people off of I-90 and I-5 it will increase congestion and not allow for these short trip movements.

Mr. Somers asked if they're asking staff to come back with more options.

Vice-chair McKenna said they just want clarification on the wording of "up to" and what Option 1 is. Right now they're working off the PPA language. He asked what they should be working off of?

Mr. Somers asked if they would have specifics.

Vice-chair McKenna asked what they would be doing on November 16th. Mr. Cummings said they would be making a PA recommendation that will be analyzed in the FEIS.

Vice-chair McKenna said they should approve a concept.

Mr. Putter said there is a sentence overview of the issue on page 15 of the Citizen's Guide that is concise and accurate.

Mr. Corman said Renton supports the process behind the extra lane issue. He said they should get the freeway into a permanent configuration. They don't want to rebuild noise walls only to tear them down 5 years later. If the model says they need a 3rd lane the whole way, they should probably just do it. If the modeling says we need truck lanes, then we should do that to. He said he wants the program to be remembered for doing a proper job.

Mr. Dye said they are in Tier 1 of the DIES and new territory of Reinventing NEPA. He said they don't have the level of detail they're used to having. He said they are working within a footprint that's been established and they just want to leave the door open.

Mr. Pflug asked the staff to fine-tune the wording so it preserves some flexibility in both directions.

Mr. Samdahl said they will come up with more specific language.

Vice-chair McKenna asked for them to further explain. He asked the staff if they are getting a sense of what the committee is looking for. Mr. Samdahl said yes.

Mr. Anderson took over the meeting's lead.

SR 167 Capacity:

Issues:

- Logical transition point
- Wetland and Property Impacts
 - Stacked roadway possibilities

SR 167 Options:

- #1 - Support PPA (up to 2 lanes added)
- #2 - Support 1 lane added
- #3 - Support no added lanes

Mr. Anderson said they looked at how they can avoid sensitive wetlands. He said they looked at double decking in some sections to avoid wetlands and showed a slide to illustrate.

Mr. Anderson said an option is to spend some additional money and minimize the impacts on wetlands.

Senator Horn asked what the Steering Committee thinks. Mr. Samdahl said the Steering Committee is supportive of up to 2 lanes with the exception of the resource agencies. He said wetlands are a big issue.

Preliminary Feedback from Committees:

- Steering Committee:
 - Local jurisdictions supportive of PPA
 - Resource agencies concerned about wetland impacts
 - Consider stacking or other avoidance measures
- Citizen Committee:
 - Majority support PPA; minority oppose
 - Look at need for improvements to entire length of SR 167

Senator Horn said they also have another project that goes from Kent to the Port of Tacoma. He said he sees up to 2 lanes in both directions for this project.

Vice-chair McKenna asked if anyone has questions about the options. There were no questions.

Mr. Cummings resumed the meeting's lead. He discussed the BNSF.

BNSF Background:

BNSF is:

- Selling/sold strips of property and intends to maintain approximately 50 foot corridor
- Has long term interest in upgrading and/or relocating line perhaps in conjunction with WSDOT and high capacity transit providers

BNSF Options:

Preferred alternative (PA) options:

- #1: Basic position (under any action alternative)
 - Seek to utilize BNSF right-of-way:
 - If adjacent to I-405 in order to avoid residential and business impacts
 - If offers environmental mitigation/enhancement
- #2: Not include in PA
 - 50' right of way would still be maintained
 - Opportunity to set up separate study to look at future joint use and upgrading opportunities
- #3: Include in PA
 - Seek to preserve property being sold for:
 - Core area future HCT uses
 - Balance for bike-pedestrian uses that support transit and other trip reduction opportunities.
 - Long trails, if part of recommendation

Preliminary Feedback from the Committees:

•Steering Committee:

- Generally supportive of concept
- Need more information on impacts on potential future uses if BNSF sells strips of property.

•Citizen Committee:

- Majority against including in PA; minority support inclusion
- Concerns about lack of definition -- public needs to know what is going to be done.
- Look at possibility of public condemnation to acquire in future?

Mr. Cummings said some areas go over high quality wetlands as part of Option 1.

Mr. Cummings said for Option 2, the BNSF would have to go through an abandonment procedure if they want to take the 50' ROW out.

Mr. Cummings said they took out the long trails for the PPA for Option 3.

Mr. Cummings said this new information is different from what they've been assuming. Now, all they're interested in is selling off pieces and not the whole thing. He said ROW beyond the 50' strip might not be available anymore.

Mr. Cummings said the BNSF would also like to be out of Renton. That would mean establishing another ROW for them to be in. He said the BNSF is willing to swap for 50' someplace else that gives them better operations.

Mr. Putter said the new information favors a position that isn't in the options. He said he wants to ensure they have the option in the event the BNSF changes its mind or abandons it. The core issue is to preserve their options rather than use them for some plan they have today. He said he would be satisfied if the PA included the option to ensure the 50' ROW will not go away.

Vice-chair McKenna said they have to go through a formal abandonment process and these procedures might already be in place. He asked the staff to obtain more information.

Ms. Ives said she wants to preserve more than 50'. She said she wants more freight in that corridor. They also need to be maximizing and preserving the option of commuter rail in that area.

Mr. Pflug said she likes the long trails in Option 3, but doesn't understand how they fit into the charter of this group. Will it turn out to be in conflict with preserving freight corridors? Where will parking lots be? She said they should decide what specific areas they want to preserve.

Ms. Cothorn said she wants a mix of Option 1 and 3.

Ms. Marshall said she's inclined toward Option 2 because she wants to ensure the future opportunity. She said funding is going to be a challenge but this is an element they don't have to include in the study. She said in the event the BNSF changes its mind about wanting to sell, she wants this group to have the first opportunity of refusal.

Senator Horn said this is a separate issue and they are under the assumption that abandonment involves a lot of regulations. He said the committee's focus needs to

be fixing this transportation problem and they need to separate the two projects. He said he wants to go with Option #2.

Mr. Edwards thanked the staff for the information. He said because the abandonment process has opened up the option of looking at alternative uses for the railway, if the BNSF were ever to abandon it, portions would be very useful, especially for bike and pedestrian use. He said sections lend themselves to different alternatives. However, it doesn't need to be included in the PA. He said they shouldn't count on this option because it's not currently available.

Mr. Somers said he's disturbed by this conversation because they've been talking all along about preserving the BNSF. He said he would not support any of the options that support eliminating the BNSF. He said it is an incredible opportunity and highlighted the program's purpose as a transportation project.

Vice-chair McKenna asked how they should address the issue if the BNSF is not for sale?

Mr. Somers said they should have a strategy in the event the railway does come up for sale. He said they need a planned strategy.

Mr. Corman said he thinks this is a vital ROW for freight. In terms of impacts for Renton, the intervals are much slower. He said the continued use of the BNSF for freight makes a lot of sense.

Mr. Putter asked the vice-chair if they could direct staff to do more research on what would happen if there were abandonment. He asked if the program could have the right of first refusal?

Vice-chair McKenna asked the staff to draft up language and do research for the potential of first refusal and the abandonment process.

Ms. Pflug said they should talk about "we" and who's getting first right of refusal.

Mr. Edwards asked if this would affect how Burlington uses the corridor?

Mr. Somers said Burlington's initial refusal to sell the railroad might be a selling tactic.

Mr. Cummings said the team will frame the managed lanes discussions and the committee can go as long as the members want since the meeting might go overtime.

Mr. Samdahl took over the meeting's lead again.

Managed Lanes on I-405:

Questions:

- Manage up to two lanes each direction along I-405?
- Utilize pricing (tolls) as a management tool?

Results of I-405 Managed Lane Analysis:

- Managed Lane Options (Compared 2 Express Lanes with 1 HOV Lane)
- HOV lanes will get full (need to switch to HOV 3+)

- Express Lanes provide good balance of vehicle and person demand along freeway
- Express Lanes have higher average person speeds for all freeway users
- Express Lanes offer some capacity for non-HOV users during peak/off-peak periods

Options for Managed Lanes on I-405:

- #1. Should we include managed lanes in PA?
 - Yes, subject to conditions and further study
 - No
- #2. If yes, should pricing (tolls) be part of the strategy?
 - Yes, subject to conditions and further study
 - No

Potential Conditions to Support Managed 'Express' Lanes:

- 1. Must maximize person and vehicle throughput
- 2. Must encourage transit and HOV mode shares
- 3. Must maintain BRT speed and reliability
- 4. Must avoid diversion of traffic to arterials and neighborhood streets
- 5. Provide possible access to long distance freight

Preliminary Feedback from Committees:

- Steering Committee:
 - Generally supportive of concept
 - PMT will follow up with members to further discuss concept.
- Citizen Committee:
 - Majority against including in PA; minority support inclusion.
 - Concerns about ability to change to other uses if federal money used.

Mr. Corman said he's against including managed lanes. He said he's worried about giving a confused message when the program goes to voters for funding. He said the voters would wonder why they have to pay for tolls if they have already initially given so much money for the project. He said he wants a simple vision to take to the voters. However, he's not against the principle of managed lanes.

Ms. Cothorn said the trucking community has concerns over managed lanes. She asked if the program has received feedback on the matter. Mr. Samdahl said they haven't performed a survey.

Ms. Cothorn said freight mobility is a big issue.

Ms. Ives said the issue of BRT is speed and reliability. She hasn't seen anything that guarantees performance yet.

Senator Horn said the answer should be "no" because managed lanes add a lot of complexity. He said he doesn't think it adds to getting the project done.

Mr. Somers said managed lanes should be included. He said they don't have a funding strategy and it affects demand. If they claim they will fix mobility then they aren't being honest.

Ms. Ives said she's in support of looking at them but has questions on BRT.

Mr. Davis suggested they allow the option for managed lanes in the future through design. He said it should be preserved as a long-term possibility. He said they are a design issue.

Ms. Marshall said she agrees this is the issue. She has done an informal poll and found people will gladly pay to be in the lane so they can have dependable reliability.

Mr. Putter said they could probably get more capacity if they more effectively manage the current capacity. He said he favors including managed lanes for a future study which will mean they will be doing something they should have been doing all along. However, he would like to put off a tolls discussion.

Mr. Putter asked how much has to be designed in and how much the managed lanes will cost.

Vice-chair McKenna asked the staff to obtain this information on what it means to keep the option open in terms of cost and what needs to be done to the facility.

Mr. Corman said the average minimum wage worker will not support this. He said they won't be getting their money's worth. He said he's OK with designing managed lanes into the program but doesn't want to make it into a central issue.

Ms. Ives said it would be a problem if the program isn't clear about their intentions up front, and then want to change the elements later. She said they should stick with the original vision. She said trying to work this element into the program after the fact is troubling.

Vice-chair McKenna asked the committee if they had any additional concerns or questions. There were no concerns or questions.

Vice-chair McKenna adjourned the meeting at 11:17. a.m.